



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/759,681

01/16/2004

Jonathan D. Levine

D/A2322

8586

41030 7590 07/29/2009

Xerox Corporation
c/o ORTIZ & LOPEZ, PLLC
P. O. BOX 4484
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87196-4484

EXAMINER

DICKERSON, CHAD S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/29/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/9/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks filed on 7/9/2009, the Applicant made several assertions regarding the final rejection mailed on 5/14/2009. First, the Applicant stated that the Examiner's interpretation of solution-independent in regards to the Kato invention was incorrect. Then, the Applicant states that the Last Office Action (OA) did not explain how the determination of an error equates to the determination that certain files need to be converted before printing. Lastly, the Applicant reiterated that the references applied do not disclose the features of 1) converting the book files from JDF into CNF which are reproduction and solution independent and 2) determining if the CNF files need to be converted to equipment specific files. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with all of these assertions.

Before going into detail about the claim features the Examiner would like to answer the question posed on page 15 of the remarks. The question stated, *"if the intermediate code is, as the Examiner submits, solution and reproduction system independent, then why would Kato generate the aforementioned intermediate code once a print request is made?"* When viewing Kato, it specifically states in paragraph [0057] that the electronic original writer (1020) does not target a specific output device, and converts an output command into a format processible by a bookbinding application (1040) or printer driver (1060) (to be described later). Here, the data is converted into this format that allows for the data to be edited while being stored or loaded from

memory. The above process occurs when the electronic original writer (1020) is designated as the device driver during the output command, or print request¹. Later on in the process, when the printer driver (1060) is designated as the device driver, the intermediate code format file is then converted into a device command interpretable by the printer for output, or like it is mentioned later on in Kato, the intermediate code is converted into print data (i.e. PDL) printable by a printer². With the above explanation, the Examiner believes the above question is answered.

Regarding the incorrect interpretation of SVG being reproduction and solution dependent, since SVG is not able to be printed out on an output device without being converted into a PDL, the Examiner considers SVG as reproduction system and solution independent. XML alone is a software and hardware independent language. One of ordinary skill in the art in terms of knowledge about markup languages would know that the purpose of XML is to have data structured, stored and transported to different platforms regardless of the platform the data is being sent to. XML data is comprised of data contained within tags and most systems use XML to store information while html is used to display the information. Kato does not in anywhere in the specification talk about the copiers containing anything that is used to convert or print data specifically in XML. Due to the conversation with Attorney Shelby on 7/21/2009 regarding the term "solution-independent, the Examiner still feels that the interpretation of the term in light of the Office Action (OA) is correct.

¹ See Kato '236 at paragraph [0058] and fig. 9.

² Id. at paragraphs [0062], [0121] and [0132]-[0136].

Also, it is clear that JDF is reproduction system and solution independent because JDF, from a broad viewpoint, is processing instructions for company's production system. In order for JDF to be solution-dependent, the printer's used in the production of the job would require the XML schema within the JDF to render, or RIP, the job into a physical print. In other words, the actual XML would be rendered. However, within JDF, XML guides the printing system to print a certain job in a certain manner, but the actual job itself may be described in PDL. For example, mentioned in the JDF specification version 1.1A, the JDF carries PDL files, which uses the storing function of the XML language, while also ordering the system to render the job in a certain manner. The whole purpose of JDF is to instruct the system to do certain things like using a certain piece of paper or a certain finishing, but the printers process the actual PDL data for printing, not the XML associated with the JDF³. Based on this information, the Examiner still believes that the interpretation listed in the last OA is correct.

Regarding the claim features, the Examiner still believes that the claim limitations are disclosed. The Kato reference discloses converting book files into CNF files that are reproduction and solution independent. The Examiner contends that the intermediate file format (IFF) files are analogous to CNF files since the IFF files are not interpretable by the printing device, but the PDL that the files are converted into are interpretable by the device. Since the drivers within the reproduction equipment depend on the data being converted into a PDL, not in an IFF, the IFF files are considered as

³ See JDF specification pages iv-vii, 46, 95 and 161 on www.job-definition-format.org

Art Unit: 2625

CNF files. The Sangroniz reference is used to contain the feature of “*converting book files from JDF into a master book*”, or a book that has gone through a prepress process⁴. The Examiner believes that with this combination of the two references, the conversion of the book files from JDF into a master book represented in CNF is performed.

With the determination of whether CNF files need to be converted into equipment specific files, the Examiner still believes this is performed as well. As seen in figure 7, S74, the system generates print data (i.e. PDL) from intermediate code that is associated with the page that is determined to be a re-print start page. The Examiner believes that the system determines if certain files that are in intermediate format, considered as CNF files, need to be converted to equipment specific files (i.e. PDL) because the system determines, based on which pages are designated as re-print start pages, that certain pages need to be converted into print data. The system searches for the number of pages that have already been printed and the pages that have not been printed once the error was detected⁵. Based on the detection of the pages that occurred after the error, the system then determines in figure 7 that these pages that are determined as re-print start pages need to be converted into PDL while the pages that are already printed do not need to be converted into print data⁶. This is a clear example of having the system determining if intermediate format files need to be converted into equipment specific files.

⁴ See Sangroniz '466 at paragraphs [0008]-[0011].

⁵ See Kato '236 at paragraphs [0139]-[0146].

⁶ Id. at paragraphs [0153]-[0158].

Therefore, with the above explanation, the Examiner believes the claim limitations are performed.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
3. JP 2003-281226 A discloses the system of the current application and can be used as under 102(a) or (e).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAD DICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CHAD DICKERSON
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625